

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are in the case as of the date of this amendment.  
No claims have been allowed.

The Examiner has indicated that Applicants claimed foreign priority, but none of the required notarized documents were filed with the application. For the record, Applicants are not claiming any foreign priority for the instant application and will, therefore, not be filing any notarized documents indicating same.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farley et al. (Farley), U.S. Patent 5,257,185, in view of Lynn Greene, VII (Greene, VII), U.S. Patent 5,727,204.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner contends that:

Farley discloses a database and information system arrangement for use in designing an architecture for a mission (see col. 10, lines 32-50), comprising:

Farley teaches a first section for storing information related to operational activities of said mission (see col. 10, lines 35-50, FIG. 1B);

Farley teaches a second section coupled to said first section for storing information related to data associated with said operational activities (see col. 10, lines 48-67); and

Farley teaches a third section coupled to said first section and said second section for storing information related to

organizations permitted to carry out said operational activities and for storing information related to storage locations for said data (see col. 4, lines 3-9 and col. 23, lines 31-41 et seq.).

Farley does not explicitly indicate the claimed "warfare mission".

Greene, VII discloses the claimed warfare mission (rapid identification of objects is critical in applications as an electronic warfare in which the appropriate assets must be activated in real time to be effective (see col. 2, lines 39-43 et seq.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention to combined the teaching of the cited references because warfare mission of Greene, VII's teachings would have allowed Farley's system to organize data representing an object attribute characteristic as a plurality of interval sets, as suggested by Greene, VII, at col. 1, lines 47-51. Warfare mission as taught by Greene, VII, improves all sets that contain elements are quickly identified on the fly (see col. 2, lines 54-57 at seq. Greene, VII).

With respect to independent claim 6, the Examiner contends that:

Farley discloses a database and information system arrangement for use in designing an operational architecture for a

mission (see col. 10, lines 32-50), comprising:

Farley teaches an operational process section describing operational activities of said mission, a sequence for said operational activities, problems associated with said operational activities and performance characterizations of said operational activities (see col. 10, lines 35-50, FIG. 1B);

Farley teaches a data section for identifying input data used by said operational activities and output data resulting from said operational activities (see col. 10, lines 48-67); and

Farley teaches an organizational section for identifying an organizational hierarchy and assets used to carry out said operational activities and for identifying storage locations for said input data and said output data (see col. 4, lines 3-9 and col. 23, lines 31-41 et seq.).

Farley does not explicitly indicate the claimed "warfare mission".

Greene, VII discloses the claimed warfare mission (rapid identification of objects is critical in applications as an electronic warfare in which the appropriate assets must be activated in real time to be effective (see col. 2, lines 39-43 et seq.)).

The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention to combined the teaching of the cited references

because warfare mission of Greene, VII's teachings would have allowed Farley's system to organize data representing an object attribute characteristic as a plurality of interval sets, as suggested by Greene, VII, at col. 1, lines 47-51. Warfare mission as taught by Greene, VII, improves all sets that contain elements are quickly identified on the fly (see col. 2, lines 54-57 at seq. Greene, VII).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In general, Farley et al., appear to teach an interactive, cross-referenced knowledge system having a development configuration by which a knowledge engineer enters knowledge content into a database and a user configuration employed by the end user to access the database for interactive learning, information retrieval and problem solving in a specified subject area. The knowledge is organized by a hierarchy of topic nodes, with each node having an associated plurality of cross referenceable information units representing a variety of types, or categories of information. The user can control the navigation path and information display sequence among information units in accordance with personal learning needs and style. One category can include a pattern of prompts and possible responses. The separation of knowledge content from program logic permits non-programmers to set up, modify and maintain the knowledge content of the system

In general, Greene, VII, appear to teach a method to organize, store and retrieve information in a database to facilitate rapid object identification. An interval set is defined as an interval on a number line. The database is built from a list of interval sets as input sets. The method organizes the interval sets such that a binary search may be used to quickly locate all interval sets of which a value is a member, i.e., given a value, all sets that contain the elements value are quickly identified.

Applicants have studied the cited prior art as well as the Examiner's specific rejections. However, Applicants respectfully acknowledge that they are having difficulty understanding the Examiner's position and arguments. It appears to Applicants that the teachings of the cited prior art (i.e., the specifically noted sections of the prior art referenced by column and line numbers in the instant office action) are unrelated to Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants will explain the differences between the following:

(i) each of the Examiner's specifically cited portions of the prior art cited against Applicants' independent claims 1 and 6, and

(ii) the respective portions of Applicants' independent claims 1 and 6 that the Examiner has referenced as being analogous to the prior art.

The Examiner first contends that Farley (at column 10, lines 35-50) teaches Applicants' "first section" (claim 1) or "operational process section" (claim 6). Applicants contend that this cited portion of Farley teaches an interactive "question and answer" system that prompts a (system) user with questions that the user can (i) respond to, (ii) ask for clarification of the question, (iii) review related information, or (iv) change questions or topics. The questions and responses from each user session are stored for possible retrieval at a later time. In contrast, Applicants' "first section" stores "information related to operational activities of a warfare mission". That is, the first section is an "operational process section" that describes "operational activities of the warfare mission, a sequence for the operational activities, problems associated with the operational activities and performance characterization of the operational activities." See page 8, line 21, to page 9, line 8 of Applicants' originally-filed specification. Applicants respectfully submit that Farley's question/answer interactivity does not teach or suggest the storage of operational activities of a warfare mission as taught and claimed by Applicants.

The Examiner next contends that Farley (at column 10, lines 458-67) teaches Applicants "second section" (claim 1) or "data section" (claim 6). Applicants contend that this cited portion of Farley teaches that the (system) user has the ability to retrieve

information and then customize a view/display of same to satisfy a particular user's (e.g., a sales rep) needs. The data used is merely raw data that is retrieved and then manipulated to satisfy a particular user's display needs. In contrast, Applicants' "second section" stores "information related to data associated with the operational activities" of the warfare mission. That is, the second section stores information that describes attributes of the data rather than the raw data itself. Claim 6 states this more specifically as the "data section" identifies "input data used by the operational activities and output data resulting from the operational activities." See page 9, line 9 to page 10, line 3 of Applicants' originally-filed specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Farley's raw data storage and manipulation thereof for customized display purposes does not teach or suggest the storage of information related to the raw data as taught and claimed by Applicants.

The Examiner thirdly contends that Farley (at column 4, lines 3-9, and column 23, lines 31-41 et seq.) teaches Applicants' "third section" (claim 1) or "organizational section" (claim 6). Applicants contend that these cited portions of Farley merely teach that:

- (i) at column 4, that a user can control what/how items will be displayed and that the user-defined items can be stored modularly; and

(ii) at column 23, that certain users can update stored content.

In contrast, Applicants' "third section" stores "information related to organizations permitted to carry out the (warfare mission's) operational activities" and stores "information related to storage locations of data" (associated with the operational activities. More specifically, Applicants' third section can be viewed as an "organizational section" that identifies "organizational hierarchy and assets" and "storage locations of the input/output data" used by the warfare mission's operational activities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Farley et al. at columns 4 and 23 do not teach or even suggest the storage of information relating to organizational attributes for the operational activities of a warfare mission as Applicants teach and claim.

Finally, the Examiner contends that Greene, VII, disclose that a warfare mission requires rapid identification of objects. While this may be true, Greene, VII merely discloses a simple database defined by a plurality of sets with each set identifying a range of possible numeric values. An input numeric value is then compared to the sets to see which one or ones of the sets it belongs to. See column 1, lines 45-63. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Greene, VII does not teach or even suggest the unique database and information system arrangement




taught by Applicants. Furthermore, the teachings of Greene, VII do not overcome the above-described shortcomings of Farley.

None of the prior art cited by the Examiner appears to teach or even suggest the unique database and information system arrangement taught by Applicants. In view of all the art of record, the claims remaining in the case are considered to patentably distinguish thereover.

It is submitted in view of these remarks that all grounds for rejection have been removed by the foregoing amendment. For the hereinabove reasons, Applicants solicit an early and favorable response.

Respectfully submitted,



HARVEY A. GILBERT  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27331

Coastal Systems Station  
Dahlgren Division  
Naval Surface Warfare Center  
Code CP2L  
6703 West Highway 98  
Panama City, FL 32407-7001  
(850) 234-4646